

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 388

August 10, 1995, 7:16 p.m.
Page S-12169 Temp. Record

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS/Export Loan Guarantees

SUBJECT: Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . S. 1087. Stevens motion to table the Bumpers modified amendment No. 2395.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 53-46

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1087, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will appropriate \$242.7 billion for the military functions of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, which is \$6.4 billion more than requested and \$2.3 billion less than the fiscal year (FY) 1995 funding level.

The Bumpers amendment would limit the total amount of loans that may be guaranteed under the new defense export loan guarantee program to \$5 billion (instead of \$15 billion) and would further mandate that any exposure fee would have to be paid by the country involved, and that any such fee could not be financed as part of the loan guaranteed by the United States.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Stevens moved to table the Bumpers amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

A few days ago, the Senate rejected a Bumpers amendment to the defense authorization bill to kill this new defense export loan program (see vote No. 357). We have already explained why this new program will have no cost to the American taxpayers. We have also explained that it will result in sales only to a few select allies, and that it will greatly benefit American defense contractors. Senators who accepted those explanations last week in voting against the previous Bumpers amendment should vote against this amendment as well, because it would effectively kill the program by denying it adequate funding.

This bill will set the total amount that may be guaranteed under the new program at \$15 billion. The Bumpers amendment would reduce that amount to \$5 billion. A \$5 billion guarantee is too small. Many arms sales are for more than \$1 billion. Allowing up to \$15 billion in guarantees is a good beginning; allowing only \$5 billion in guarantees would be barely enough to start the program.

(See other side)

YEAS (53)			NAYS (46)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (43 or 80%)		Democrats (10 or 22%)	Republicans (11 or 20%)		Democrats (35 or 78%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Breaux	Campbell	Akaka	Hollings		Bradley ⁴
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Dodd	Domenici	Baucus	Johnston		
Bennett	Jeffords	Ford	Faircloth	Biden	Kennedy		
Bond	Kempthorne	Heflin	Gramm	Bingaman	Kerrey		
Brown	Lott	Inouye	Grassley	Boxer	Kerry		
Burns	Mack	Lieberman	Hatfield	Bryan	Kohl		
Chafee	McConnell	Moynihan	Kassebaum	Bumpers	Lautenberg		
Coats	Murkowski	Nunn	Kyl	Byrd	Leahy		
Cochran	Nickles	Pell	Lugar	Conrad	Levin		
Cohen	Packwood	Robb	McCain	Daschle	Mikulski		
Coverdell	Pressler		Roth	Dorgan	Moseley-Braun		
Craig	Santorum			Exon	Murray		
D'Amato	Shelby			Feingold	Pryor		
DeWine	Simpson			Feinstein	Reid		
Dole	Smith			Glenn	Rockefeller		
Frist	Snowe			Graham	Sarbanes		
Gorton	Specter			Harkin	Simon		
Grams	Stevens				Wellstone		
Gregg	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Helms	Thurmond						
	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

We voted against the straightforward attempt to kill this new program a few days ago, and we will vote against today's attempt to kill it by shrinking it into oblivion.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

A majority of our colleagues would not join with us last week to kill this proposal to guarantee weapons sales to foreign governments, many of which are broke and have no business buying weapons in the first place. Countries like Turkey and the Philippines, which will be eligible for these taxpayer-guaranteed loans, are poor credit risks. Further, they should not be buying billions of dollars worth of weapons when they have so many destitute citizens who are in need of care. This Bumpers amendment is more modest than the Bumpers amendment that our colleagues previously rejected. Instead of killing the program, it would limit the amount that would be guaranteed to \$5 billion. Thus, the maximum amount the American taxpayers could end up losing would be \$5 billion. We think this amendment is reasonable, and urge our colleagues to give it their support.